

REPORT OF THE RESTORATIVE TECHNIQUES TASK FORCE

This is the report of the committee after the most recent meeting and testing. For supervisors, what happened was that we met the night of August 11, 2004. In addition, teeth of various compositions (melamine, aka Ivorine; multilayered plastic; and composite) were distributed to the committee, who evaluated the teeth for purposes of the new composite portion of the examination, and reports were received from all of the members. The following items were discussed at the meeting:

- a) Selection of typodont and teeth – After evaluating samples of typodonts from four manufacturers (Columbia, Kilgore, Acadental, and Frasaco), a majority of the committee voted for the Kilgore as the sole typodont for the RT examination. One major factor was that Kilgore was the only manufacturer that provided artificial teeth made from composite material, as opposed to plastic, and therefore most closely provided occupational analysis support. Composite was found to be superior to the other materials in regard to most closely matching the sensation of working on human teeth, and in that it was the hardest artificial material. The actual vote was that three members voted for the Kilgore, one voted for the Columbia, and two voted that either one of them was acceptable.
- b) Suitability of the materials for bonding of composite - the committee members tested all three artificial materials, and all agreed that composite bonded well enough to any of the three materials for examination purposes. The committee ratified its decision that the wax pattern and die portion of the examination be replaced by a composite preparation and filling of a composite restoration on a different tooth. All the materials were found to be able to have a bevel without flaking or other problem due to the bonding being done to artificial material rather than enamel.
- c) Examination procedure - with the elimination of the wax pattern, the committee noted that the examination typodont did not degrade with time, so it was decided to recommend that the examination be given with proctor supervision, and grading to occur after all candidates had left the examination site, with the typodonts mailed back to the candidates after grading. It was felt that that process would make the examination much easier for the examiners.
- d) Grading Criteria - some discussion was held in regard to the grading criteria for the RT exam parts, and it was decided to defer that evaluation until after all members had a better opportunity to evaluate the current criteria.

e) Translation of the "5" grade - the committee evaluated the current valuation of the 5 grade at 95%, and decided to recommend that the value be changed to value the 5 grade at 100%. The reasoning was that it better substantiated the statutory command that candidates score be at least 75%, both overall and for at least two of the three sections, whereas with the highest possible grade being 95% for only the clinical portion, that a score of 75% would not be 75% of the highest possible score. It was recognized that this might result in a slightly higher pass rate, but the effect was thought to be negligible.

f) Use of Enamel natural teeth - the task force recognized that natural teeth would be possible at some time, as is done in the WREB for the endo portion, but some members pointed out that there was a problem with use of the tooth could be an OSHA violation, and others noted that such teeth can have a tendency to fracture, especially if allowed to dry.

Attached to this email is a draft of proposed regulatory changes to Section 1041 to make it consistent with our recommendations. The committee will meet again to consider changes in the criteria sheets.

Respectfully Submitted,

Arthur Schultz, D.D.S.
Darrell Simien, D.D.S.
Elmer Bangloy, D.D.S.
Enrique Garcia, D.D.S.
Rachel Johnson, D.D.S.
Richard Frieden, D.D.S.